

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-27, 29-31 and 33-48 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated August 7, 2008, all pending claims were rejected. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5-27 and 36-48 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lowitz et al. (US 5,485,554) (“Lowitz”). These rejections now are traversed.

Claim 1 now recites a system for printing media content, comprising, *inter alia*:

a user interface for receiving instructions from a user for controlling segmentation of the media content for printing based on one or more features within the media content and for generation of a printable representation of the media content, the user interface comprising a content selection field displaying a graphical representation of the media content and the instructions from the user comprising selection of a segment of the graphical representation of the media content;

Lowitz does not disclose or suggest these aspects of the claimed invention. Lowitz merely discloses processing an input video data stream to select a frame for printing, according to various triggers that may be selected by the user, e.g., a scene change, via a sequence trigger setup key. *See* Lowitz, Abstract, col. 5, ll. 57-61. However, Lowitz’s frame selection does not include “a content selection field displaying a graphical representation of the media content and the instructions from the user comprising selection of a segment of the graphical representation of the media content” Indeed, none of the interfaces of Lowitz display a graphical representation of the input video data stream. Thus, Lowitz does not disclose or suggest at least “a user interface for receiving instructions from a user for controlling segmentation of the media content for printing based on one or more features

within the media content and for generation of a printable representation of the media content, the user interface comprising a content selection field displaying a graphical representation of the media content and the instructions from the user comprising selection of a segment of the graphical representation of the media content.” Thus, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Lowitz.

Independent claim 27 also is patentably distinguishable over Lowitz for the above reasons. Dependent claims 2-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-26, 29-31, 33-38, and 40-51 variously depend from claims 1 and 27, shown above to be patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. All arguments advanced above with respect to claims 1 and 27 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 2-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-26, 29-31, 33-38, and 40-51. Thus, claims 2-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-26, 29-31, 33-38, and 40-51 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the reasons stated above in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein. Claims 13, 18, and 39 are cancelled.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 29-31 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lowitz in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0249650 to Freedman (“Freedman”). These rejections now are traversed.

Claims 29-31 and 33-35 were shown above to be patentably distinguishable over Lowitz.

Freedman does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Lowitz, nor does the Examiner allege that it does. Freedman is relied upon by the Examiner to show the additional limitations recited in dependent claims 29-31 and 33-35. Thus, claims 29-31 and 33-35 are patentably distinguishable over Freedman, alone or in combination with Lowitz.

The deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in combination, fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. As discussed above, the references do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-27, 29-31, 33-38, and 40-51, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jonathan J. Hull et al.

Date: January 7, 2009

By: Jennifer R. Bush

Jennifer Bush, Registration No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650)-335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200